(ii) Twenty-sixth Report of the Committee on Cochin Shipyard Limited and Minutes of the sittings of the Committee relating thereto.

REPORT OF ON-THE-SHOP STUDY VISIT OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE WELFARE OF SCHEDULED CASTES AND SCHEDULED TRIBES

श्री राधाकिशन मालवीय (मध्य-प्रदेश) : मैं अनुसूचित जातियों और अनुसूचित जनजातियों के कल्याण सम्बन्धी समिति द्वारा फरवरी, 1987 के दौरान इंडियन एयरलाइन्स, नई दिल्ली के मुख्यालय का मौके पर किये गए अध्ययन पर प्रतिवेदन की एक प्रति (अंग्रेजी तथा हिन्दी में) सभा पटल पर रखता हूं।

STATEMENT

Re. Government business for the week Commencing the 27th April, 1987

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (SHRI M. M. JACOB): Sir, I beg to announce that the Government Business in this House for the next week will consist of:—

1. Consideration of any item of Government Business carried over from today's Order Paper.

2. Consideration and passing of:

(a) The Payment of Gratuity (Amendment) Bill, 1987.

(b) The Merchant Shipping (Amendment) Bill, 1987, as passed by Lok Sabha.

(c) The Factories (Amendment) Bill, 1987, as passed by Lok Sabha.

(d) The Parsi Marriage and Divorce (Amendment) Bill, 1987.

3. Discussion on the working of the Ministry of Defence.

Discussion on the working of the Ministry of External Affairs

MR. CHAIRMAN: Now we take up discussion on the working of the Ministry of External Affairs. Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH (Rajasthan): Sir, there is nobody from the Ministry.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Minister for Parliamentary Affairs will you see that some Minister from the External Affairs comes—some representative from the External Affairs Ministry.

SHRI M. S. GURUPADASWAMY (Karnataka): Sir, foreign affairs of a country...

THE MINISTER OF URBAN DEVELOPMENT (SHRIMATI MOHSINA KIDWAI): No Zero Hour here?

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI (Madhya Pradesh): Need for Zero Hour is being emphasised by the Ministers. It is really unfair to the House that the Member is initiating a debate and the External Affairs Minister is not there.

AN HON. MEMBER: Let us reintroduce it. It gives a surprise and some amount of gimmick at least.

MR. CHAIRMAN: There are other Cabinet Ministers who have joint responsibility, but I have already....

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: May I point out yesterday perhaps it was suggested that on Thursday next we take up discussion on the media, but I am told that Thursday is a non-official day.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I have asked all the leaders to see me in my chamber.

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: It is all right. You can decide just now. We can have it earlier.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We will discuss it in my room. You can come to my room a little later. Mr. Gurupadaswamy has also to come. I want to consult you on this matter.

SHRI M.S. GURUPADASWAMY: The foreign affairs of a country are not less important than domestic affairs. In my view they are the two sides of the same coin.

Once upon a time the foeign affairs was regarded as a close and exclusive preserve of a professional diplomat. Even sometimes it was regarded as the Cinderella of the Government of the day. But no longer now, partly because the foeign affairs are influencing not only global politics and the international relations of countries but they also influence tremendously the domestic developments of any country—big and small. So, Sir, foreign affairs being very vital for a nation, there should not be any ad hoc perfunctory approach to the problems of international politics. But, of late, I am sorry to say that there is a singular lack of any system, lack of comprehensive approach, scientific study and great involvement of sister agencies of the Government and all the people in shaping, formulating and guiding the policy of the Government.

As you are aware, Sir, in the past when Shri Jawaharlal Nehru was the Prime Minister every session had a useful debate on foreign affairs. He would introduce the subject, he would speak on the subject and again he replied on it. But this practice died along with him. My first suggestion would be that this healthy and sound practice should be revived and foreign affairs should be debated by Parliament during every session as was so in the earlier days.

Secondly, Sir, foreign policy being very vital as I said and situated as we are, requires a thrust, a focus, definition of priorities, perspectives and the goals. It is not enough to deal with these things in a desultory fashion at random off and on as situation arises. In foreign policy we should abandon the habit of living day-to-day. It should not be the politics emanating from a situation arising at the time. Sir, the nation requires vision. I am reminded of a proverb of the Old Testament, "if there is no vision or wherever there is no vision, people will die." Foreign policy of the country requires a vision of its own; what is the perspective we should have and what are the parameters within which we have got to function? Sir, it is regretful, over a period of time, there has been considerable lackadaisical attitude imported, brought in into the working of the foreign policy cells which are operating in the Government of India. I do not see the same fervour, the same unity, the same purposefulness in the working of the Ministry itself. There are pro-American sections in the Ministry, pro-Soviet sections in the Ministry. I do not think there are any pro-Indian sections in the Ministry functioning. Perhaps, you know, Lord Palmeston said when he was asked in Parliament, what is the main theme of your foreign policy? He said, my main theme, my main goal, my main principle is that the nation's interest should remain paramount always. Though I do not want to extend this to a ridiculous length, I would like to emphasize the importance of the statement. While dealing with global affairs, international issues, you should not be blind to your own interests, the basic interest of the nation. I say this in spite of the fact that I know, in some areas, in some fields, the national interest and international interest converge, copulate. They are co-terminus. But of late, I find the Governmet is singularly lacking in defining our interest and defining our goals.

[The **Deputy Chairman** in the Chair]

Therefore, Madam, my another suggestion would be the Government should come with a white paper wherein it should tell the nation, tell the world, what are the basic imperatives that guide our foreign policy. The foreign policy of a country does not come from the blue. The geography of a nation, the history of a nation, the culture of a nation, the traditions, the compulsions of the time have an over-riding bearing on the formulation of the foreign policy of a country. So, while a white paper is issued, naturally these factors, these vital factors, have got to be taken into consideration. There is an iron law of international politics, just as there is an iron law of wages in economics. The iron law of international politics compels that no powerful country in the world will like any other country in the world to become more powerful or equally powerful. This is the iron law of international politics. This is, in other words, the balance of power concept. This is, in other words, the politics of equilibrium. In 1950s the international system was divided between two rigid

[Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy]

blocs. But in 1960s there was a lessening of this rigidity between the two powerful nations in particular. And it proved a death-knell to the bipolar world. China which was a part of the Soviet system got out of that system. France which was a part of the American system also got out of that system. Therefore, there was this, disintegration of the two power blocs system which prevailed in 1950s. With the 1970s a further diffusion of power had occurred within the international system. As a part of this diffusion, the middle powers have acquired a greater political importance than before. India was one. After 1970s India has become a strong middle power, particularly after the 1971 Bangladesh War. But after 1970s, and with the beginning of 1980s, there has been a consistent onslaught, attack, on our position as a middle power; particularly the United States would not allow India to become a middle power. Grudgingly Nixon, after some time during his Presidency, admitted that India is a powerful country in South-Asia. But still India's position as a middle power has been considerably eroded because of various things and particularly because no superpower would like India to grow up. That is the point. Madam, a nation's strength depends upon its defensive capability and it depends upon other factors too. India has got a large population. It is a vast subcontinent and it is vast in area. It has defensive capability and it has got a subcontinental economy and resources. In addition, it has got a large army. But India still cannot maintain its position as a middle power because it has no offensive weapons. It does not have offensive weapons at all. Its defensive capability is very much limited and it has no adequate sophisticated strategic weapons which are necessary to make a country powerful. In addition, it has no free floating resources. In other words, it has no economic surpluses. In the world of today, if you want to influence people and win friends, you must have economic surpluses which you can use to your advantage. You can use it to your advantage by apportioning or sharing your economic prosperity to the other countries which you like. We do not have those resources, those surplus economic resources. That is why the country is still struggling to establish itself as a power. The United States knows that Pakistan, though it can be called a frontline State as far as they are concerned, cannot face the Soviet Union; it cannot. Obviously. In spite of that, they are arming Pakistan to the teeth, to the maximum. The purpose is to contain India, not to contain Russia. Russia cannot be contained because it is a superpower. Even if Pakistan serves as a frontline State and provides bases for the United States, its efficacy is limited. But its efficacy is great in the matter of containing the growing power of India. No superpower including Russia will allow India to become a superpower. This is my view. Russia does not want China to grow equal to its own strength. Therefore, we should realise that American aid to Pakistan is not only to equip Pakistan against Russia to a limited extent, it is also to contain India and Indian supremacy. We must have this aspect as a part of our consideration when we formulate policies. Madam, America knows that China is not a friend of India. It may not be hostile to India, but definitely it is not a friend of India. We know it. In the long run, in Asia the rivalry between India and China may become all important because of the geographical situation and because of the potential we have. So, when we talk of our neighbours, we should not lose perspective that China is also our neighbour. We have got a long-drawn frontier with China. Therefore, in our calculations, we should take China, Pakistan and the Middle East into consideration while formulating our policy. It is said that nations arm themselves because it becomes necessary due to compulsions and because it is necessary in the existing circumstances. Nations arm themselves because there is mistrust among nations. So long as mistrust continues, nations have to arm themselves. Mistrust does not emanate from defence preparations and the Army. You arm yourself because there is mistrust. Not mistrust because you are armed. Therefore, when there is distrust and suspicion among neighbours and also in the world, India has got to prepare itself. As I said earlier, your defence strategy has got to be revamped. You must also have offensive strategy. Offence

is the best form of defence. All of you are aware of that. In spite of our best efforts, we have not been able to keep the external forces away from the Indian Ocean and from the sub-continent. We have failed in that. The blame is not entirely ours. There are different factors which were responsible for this failure on our part. But the fact remains that the Government of India has failed and this nation has failed to keep the external forces away and check them from operating in the sub-continent, in the Indian Ocean and in South-East Asia. We are still seeing that some countries in South Asia, in South-East Asia and in other regions are acting as proxies of the super powers. They are just proxies. They have no independent policy of their own in global politics. India is in a very dangerous, vulnerable position. Madam, we have established an Association of South Asian countries—SAARC. We welcome it. I would also go along with the Government that this has got to be consolidated and strengthened. But SAARC is passing through a very critical phase, through a crisis. For, any association of nations, goodwill is important, peace is important. The interests of this region have got to be harmonised. I am reminded of the famous saying of Machiavelli that peace is the breathing time for the Governments to contrive and plot. It should not happen. It was the politics of the 18th and 19th centuries. Even now some of the Super powers are continuing to observe this concept in reality. This Government and this country have asserted many times in the past that they believe in peace. We are committed to the United Nations. We believe in the sovereignty and the integrity and the independence of the nations. We believe in the freedom of the human race. We have said all this. We have been repeating it. But I say that this rhetoric has got to be translated into reality. We should try to help the process of normalisation first and foremost with our neighbours. Pakistan is an important factor. It is being equipped by America, as I said earlier, for its own designs. But there is deep mistrust between India and Pakistan. There is no denying of this fact. So long as this mistrust and suspicion and hatred between the two countries persist, normalisation is impossible between these two countries. Pakistan is on the road to have a nuclear bomb. In spite of this, America is helping Pakistan with the most sophisticated weapons, and the surveillance planes in addition. This will introduce a dangerous element, a very destablising element for the SAARC. On the other side, China is occupying a part of our territory even now. We have reacted sharply against the development in Pakistan. But I do not see the same vigour, the same aggressiveness and firmness against China. Why? China has really occupied our territory. And I am not sure whether China and India are going to talk again, will meet again in the next round in India. China is taking an aggressive posture. It is blaming us that we are concentrating our troops on our border, whereas the fact is that China has been concentrating its troops all along the line, not now, for the last many years. They have built roads, camps, shelters, and they have made preparations. For what? But the Indian reaction, particularly the Government of India's reaction is pitiful in this. I do not advocate war with China. I do believe that this has got to be settled by negotiation, effective negotiation. We made a historical blunder long time past. I do not want to go into that question when Pandit Nehru declared that Tibet is not sovereign and that it is under the suzerainty of China. That was the biggest mistake made. Nothing like that was in the records. It was only the invention of the British to suit their convenience to win over China. They said you have got notional control over Tibet. During the pre-British days there was nothing like the suzerainty of China over Tibet. In the Treaty of 1914, three parties participated, one from China one from Tibet and one from India. They signed the Treaty of 1914. The Tibetan representative went to the Conference as a representative of an independent country. Therefore, we committed a blunder, a historic blunder, in recognising China's suzerainty over Tibet. No power in the world, has recognised it till now. Only India and Britain have accepted it. Anyway, I do not want to go into this past history. I Just wanted to remind the House of this. We are reaping the fruit of that today. Why is China on our border? Because Tibet is a part of China

[Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy]

and that is why we are having all this difficulty with China. But we cannot unsettle what is settled already. Therefore, I would now like the Government of India to have a time-frame within which they can settle this issue. Otherwise, how long can this go on? It cannot go on for ever and for ever. You and China should sit together, draw out a plan, a time-frame, within which you should settle the entire matter. There is no question of our territory south of the McMahon line in the Eastern side to be handed over to China, there is no question on that.

Therefore, it is necessary with a view to have peaceful relations and friendly and normal cooperation, with China that we should come to a settlement with China through negotiations, through effective negotiations not by meeting once in a way, but by continuous meetings. Till you arrive at a solution. There should be continuous meetings at official level, followed by Ministerial level and later on by meetings between the heads of Governments. This is necessary. Then, coming to the other factor which is destablishing, which is causing tension and conflict, is Sri Lanka. Sri Lanka has really become a festering sore to India. I do not want to go into all the details because we have debated this off and on in this House. But all our efforts at mediation have failed. This is a fact. I would ask my friend Mr N. D. Tiwari whether he is still hopeful of mediation and settle the matter. If he can do that, nothing like it. I am with him. But my misgivings are, he has failed and he is going to fail because today Sri Lanka is much more vindictive than before. Jayewardene feels he can settle the matter through military means. He is talking of peace and negotiation quly with the Government of India! but he is not talking in the same language with the ethnic minorities there. There has been daily massacre. There is a virtual genocide and violation of human rights. Men, women and children are being killed everyday. Sri Lanka has become boiling cauldron for the Tamils. I ask him whether his conciliation, his friendly persuasion, his mediation and his diplomacy will solve this issue in the immediate future. I would like him to do two things, without elaborating my point on that. One is, he should immediately take stock of the situation. There is military operation, there is violence going on. So, an immediate assessment of the situation is necessary and also the efficacy of mediation. Secondly, he should advise all the Tamil groups who are divided to come together. With divisions among themselves, it is difficult to negotiate. Therefore, the Government of India should bring all these militants or non-militants, the moderates, all of them together and 19th December proposal should be pursued. That should form the basis for negotiations Incidentally, the Government should tell the Sri Lanka Government to stop its military operations. There should not be any killings at all. There should be lifting of the economic embargo on the North and the East, because it is the women and the children who always suffer. The Government should effectively intervene.

Lastly, may I suggest, an effective warning is necessary; otherwise, I am afraid, Sri Lanka Government will not take you seriously. A very effective warning is necessary, warning which will bring them to senses, and a warning which will convey the message that continuation of this genocide may not be tolerated now, as in the past. This has got to be made clear to them.

Madam, then, Indian Ocean. This is another important area where all of us are concerned. As on today, both the superpowers have got their naval ships, nuclear naval ships. Americans have got more, more facilities than the Russians. But a decision was taken long back, to convene a international conference in Colombo in 1981. It was repeated later on in 1982 and 1983. This was to make the Indian Ocean a bone of peace. I do no know what happened to that effort I do not know whether it is still being continued by the Government of India or they have lost interest in this. I still maintain that an international conference on the militarisation of the *Indian Ocean* should be convened. We are taking so much interest in apartheid, which is very necessary. This is another aspect where the whole world is concerned, in which we are deeply involved. But in the

matter of the Indian Ocean, I would like the Government of India to take the initiative and bring about an international conference so that the Indian Ocean can be declared a zone of peace. (*Time bell rings*)

Lastly, Madam, I came across two statements, by Mr. Gorbachev and Mr. Reagan. They are very important. They foretell or prognosticate the shape of things to come. Madam, President Reagan said on 22nd September, 1986, while addressing the United Nations. These are his words. I quote:

> "Peace is more than just the absence of war. True peace is justice. True *peace is freedom and true peace dictates* the recognition of human rights."

Here is the quotation, of Mr. Gorbachev. In his speech delivered at Vladivostoc, he observed—I quote:

> "Mankind is living through a difficult dramatic time. But it has reserve of strength which allows it not simply to survive but also to learn to live in a new civilised world. In other words, to live without the threat of war, in peace and freedom, when the benefit of man and the maximum development of the possibilities of personality will be the highest criterion but they require a persistent struggle against the common enemy with threat of universal destruction."

Madam, of late, there seem to be healthy signs, good signs, that both the super-powers are having a liberal approach towards each oher. Mr. Gorbachev, as you know, suggested some time back that he is prepared to withdraw the medium-range nuclear missiles. Americans did not trust the Russians on this. Now, when Mr. George Shultz visited Moscow, just a few days back, he had talks with his counterpart in Russia. At that time, Gorbachev made a sudden, dramatic announcement which took not only George Shulz by surprise but also American Government and it came as a pleasant surprise to us here. He has said, significantly, that he is prepared to dismantle short-range missiles in Europe. He talked of middle-range missiles earlier, but he went further now that not only he would remove middle-range missiles but he would destroy all these missiles, both middle-range and short-range missiles. America was not prepared for this kind of a sudden announcement by Gorbachev. Here is an opportunity. There is crisis in the world. There is the crisis of armament and nuclear race, tensions and conflict, strife of various sorts. There are alliances, groupings, blocs, bases all round the world. Here is a statement made by Gorbachev, a very important statement I take it, which I think Americans have welcomed. After some time they recovered from their shock. They *did not expect it from Gorbachev. They* recovered and hey seemed to have welcome it. So, I think this is the beginning of the end of detrrence. I thought, all of us thought, detente was dead sometime past. This however gives an opening. This crisis which is bedeviling the world has to be converted, changed to an opportunity. The challenges that we are facing today in the world have to be changed to opportunities of conciliation, peace and friendship. And India should play an effective role. Firstly, it should stabilise, consolidate its position in South Asia. It should try to remove the mistrust, suspicion and misgivings that are operating among our neighbours, settle the Chinese border issue with us and then, try to dismantle the aparthied. But more than that, India and the nonaligned powers should take this opportunity and influence the great powers to begin their talk, and talk effectively. If missiles are dismantled in Europe, this will pave the way for reduction in conventional arms later on. Then the United Nations can become more effective. International relations will become more peaceful, friendly. There could be mutually beneficial cooperation beween all countries. In an atmosphere of peace in the neighbourhood, in a growing peace in the world, India can play very effective role. Therefore, Madam, I would like my friend, Shri Narayan Datt Tiwari, and the Prime Minister to give thought to some of he suggestions I have made in this regard.

[Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy]

There is one more point which I forgot to point out, and that is our diplomacy abroad. It has got to be strengthened and rationalised. In many missions I have seen our officials are very callous and indifferent. I am not talking of their callousness or indifference to the Members of Parliament. I do not mind that, but on issues they are callous, indifferent and they are not up to date. I think the Foreign Service needs to be strengthened, reorganised, streamlined. Proper expertise has got to be built and I would like in this context that the Government should think of encouraging expert groups like other countries to have studies made on problem areas. Give them money, give them help, let the expert groups function effectively in various areas, realms and fields, on various issues. That has got to be done. It is not being done at all. We depend entirely or mostly on Foreign Affairs Ministry for every thing. That is not necessary. Then it is not correct to give up appointing public men as ambassadors abroad. Of late, I am told there is discouragement of appointing public men to various Chanceries. If that is the decision, it is a wrong decision. Public men can prove better than professional diplomats in this as ours is a multi-dimensional world, complicated world. Complex situations do arise. A politician, a leader can play a better role, a far effective role than a professional diplomat. I do not say that professional diplomats should not go. They should. They are there. But there should be a healthy mixing up of the politician and the diplomat while postings are done by the Ministry to various Chanceries of the world.

SHRI P. N. SUKUL (Uttar Pradesh): Madam, there is no doubt about it and I agree with my predecessor that the external affairs are as important for a country as the internal affairs and both are interdependent also. For a sovereign State, it is very important how it is viewed, how it is looked upon by other countries and what international goodwill it enjoys. As regards India, there is no doubt about it that we enjoy considerable international goodwill and it is because of a very successful foreign policy that all our leaders like Pt. Nehru, Mrs. Gandhi have been hailed as world leaders with a lot of international following. Our present Prime Minister, Shri Rajiv Gandhi, is also following the same policy.

For four decades almost, since our Independence, our foreign policy has remained the same. It is one sphere where our Government has enjoyed goodwill even amongst the progressive elements of our Opposition parties. They have supported it.

As Mr. Gurupadaswamy was saying, while building our international image, we should not ignore our own interests, the basic interests of the country. It is a matter of great satisfaction that our leaders like Pt. Nehru and Mrs. Gandhi, and even Shri Rajiv Gandhi, have never lost sight of our basic interests and our foreign policy has never militated against our basic interests. That is why today we are the most developd among the developing counries of the world; we are the leader of the developing countries. That is why in the fields of industry, agriculture, technology, we have been able to make such rapid strides. There lies the success of our philosophers, of our leaders.

As I was saying, there has been a definite consistency in our foreign policy. And this consistency has been there only because we have stuck to certain principles, certain norms. We believe in peace and co-existence, we believe in non-
1.00 P.M. alignment, non-interference in others' affairs and mutual regard for the sovereignty of other nations.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now, before I adjourn the House for lunch, I have to announce that the honourable Chairman has desired that the Calling-Attention on Media be taken up on Tuesday, the 28th April. The House stands

adjourned for lunch and will meet again at 2.30.

The House then adjourned for lunch at one minute past one of the clock.

The House reassembled after lunch at thirty-four minutes past two of the clock,

The Vice-Chairman (Shrimati Kanak Mukherjee) : in the Chair

RESOLUTION RE. NEW SUGAR POLICY

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRIMATI KANAK MUKHERJEE): Shri Virendra Verma to move the Resolution regarding the new sugar policy.

श्री वीरेन्द्र वर्मा (उत्तर प्रदेश): महोदया, मैं निम्नलिखित संकल्प उपस्थित करता हूं:—

"इस तथ्य को ध्यान में रखते हुये कि सरकार द्वारा घोषित नयी चीनी नीति न तो गन्ना उत्पादकों और न ही उपभोक्ताओं के हित में है, बल्कि चीनी मिल मालिकों के हितों का संवर्धन करती है, यह सभा सिफारिश करती है कि:—

(i) गन्ने का लाभकारी मूल्य, गन्ने और चीनी की उत्पादन लागत और मूल्यों में सामान्य वृद्धि को ध्यान में रखते हुये वैज्ञानिक पद्धति पर आधारित होना चाहिये जिससे कि अधिक मात्रा में गन्ना और चीनी का उत्पादन करने के लिये प्रोत्साहन दिया जा सके;

(ii) सहकारी चीनी मिलों का स्वामित्व शेयरधारियों (गन्ना उत्पादकों) को तत्काल अन्तरित किया जाना चाहिये और लाभ को प्रति वर्ष शेयरधारियों में नियमित रूप से वितरित किया जाना चाहिये;

(iii) नये चीनी एककों की स्थापना का प्रमुख आधार गन्ना क्षेत्र और चीनी की वसूली होना चाहिये;

(iv) नयी और आधुनिक चीनी मिलें एक दूसरे से 25 कि मी० से कम दूरी पर नहीं होनी चाहिये और पेराई क्षमता गन्ने की उपलब्धता के अनुसार 2500 मीटरी टन की बजाय 1500 और 1800 मीटरी टन के बीच होनी चाहिये;

(v) देश में समस्त पुरानी और अप्रचलित चीनी मिलों के आधुनिकीकरण का एक कार्यक्रम बनाया जाना चाहिये और उसे तत्काल लागू किया जाना चाहिये; और

(vi) मिल क्षेत्रों में गन्ना अनुसंधान कार्यक्रम तथा अन्य विकास गतिविधियों यथा सिंचाई, सड़कों का निर्माण, नालियों की व्यवस्था आदि को उपयुक्त रूप में बढ़ाया जाना चाहिये।"

उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदया, भारत विश्व का प्रमुख गन्ना उत्पादक देश है। ससार में जितना गन्ना पैदा होता है उसका 25 प्रतिशत क्षेत्रफल इंडिया में है। सन् 1981-82, 1982-83 में भारत ने 84 लाख 36 हजार और 82 लाख 32 हजार टन क्रमशः चीनी का उत्पादन किया। विदेशों को चीनी भी भेजी और आवश्यक विदेशी मुद्रा भी भारत ने अर्जित की थी। किन्तु इसके पश्चात् उत्पादकों की उपेक्षा की गई और सन् 1984 से सन् 1986 के दो वर्षों में 33 लाख टन चीनी का विदेश से आयात किया गया। जो देश विदेशो को चीनी भेजकर विदेशी मुद्रा अर्जित करता है जिसने दुनिया में सबसे ज्यादा चीनी का उत्पादन करके रिकार्ड स्थापित किया है वह मजबूर हो जाय विदेशों से चीनी मंगाने के लिये अपनी विदेशी मुद्रा गवांकर तो यह हमारे लिये शर्म की बात है। जिन चीजों में हम विदेशी मुद्रा कमा सकते हैं उनमें भी हम विदेशों से विदेशी मुद्रा गंवाकर के आयात करें तो यह हमारे लिये लज्जा की बात है और 800 करोड़ रुपये की चीनी हमने इन दो वर्षों में मंगाई है। चालू सीजन में 7 लाख टन चीनी का आयात किये जाने के आदेश हैं। महोदया, यह ऐसा क्यों हुआ है ? कहां किसानों की उपेक्षा हुई ? क्यों चीनी का उत्पादन गिरा ? क्यों गन्ने का उत्पादन गिरा ? सन् 1981-82, 1982-83, 1983-84 के वर्षों में जो एग्रीकल्चरल प्राइस कमीशन ने गन्ने के मूल्य की संस्तुति की थी भारत सरकार ने वह संस्तुति स्वीकार नहीं की और गन्ने का स्टेट्युटरी मूल्य तीनों वर्षों में लगातार 13 रुपये क्विंटल ही रखा